Attorney Docket: 920607-95597

Amendment B

II. REMARKS

A. Introduction

Applicants submit this Response in a bona fide attempt to (i) advance the prosecution of this case, (ii) answer each and every ground of objection and rejection as set forth by the Examiner, (iii) place the claims in a condition for allowance, and (iv) place the case in better condition for consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of this Response.

As indicated above, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 have been amended. Claims 6-12, 14 and 17 have also been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit that the noted amendments merely make explicit that which was (and is) disclosed or implicit in the original disclosure. The amendments thus add nothing that would not be reasonably apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains.

C. Response to Rejections

1. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, "as failing to comply with the written description requirement." The Examiner contends:

> While the specification discloses a plurality of waveforms, the original disclosure does not provide support for a second waveform signal from/following the first waveform signal and transmitting it to the body, in combination with the other steps in the claim.

As indicated above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 15 to reflect that at least one of the provided plurality of waveform signals is selected and transmitted to a cardiac regulatory point in the body. Applicants respectfully submit that the noted amendment is in accord with and, hence, supported by the original disclosure.

Applicants accordingly respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket: 920607-95597 Amendment B

2. 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 6-12, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 & 103. As indicated above, Applicant's have canceled the noted claims.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants having answered each and every ground of objection and rejection as set forth by the Examiner, and having added no new matter, believe that this response clearly overcomes the reference of record, and now submit that Claims 1-5, 13 and 15-16 in the above-referenced patent application are in condition for allowance and the same is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact their Attorneys of record at the telephone number below to expedite prosecution of the application.

Вy

Respectfully submitted, Francis Law Group

Trancis Law Stoup

Ralph C. Francis Reg. No. 38,884

Dated: January 11, 2006 FRANCIS LAW GROUP 1942 Embarcadero Oakland, California 94606 (510) 533-1100